now called for.

13. Regarding claims 33-60

In claim 33, we note that no account seems to have been taken of the last-mentioned feature of claim 33, namely that *all the said points on the outwards-facing side-surfaces are not wetted by the minimum-standing-body* of water. This feature distinguishes from e.g VAIL. VAIL shows a chamber with baffles, and of course VAIL's baffles are wetted on both sides by the water being treated. We cannot imagine what structure the skilled person could come up with, that could be regarded as a merely obvious variant of VAIL, in which the walls that define the long/narrow treatment trough are wetted only on the inside.

14. Furthermore, we draw attention to the above remarks about rejecting claims that contain dimensional limitations. Of the claims 33-60 that have been rejected, i.e claims 33-40,44-58, all are rejected under 35 USC 103, not under 35 USC 102. For the reasons as discussed, it is our position that the PTO has not made out a prima facie case of obviousness in respect of those claims.

All the points in the O/A having been addressed, we look forward now to receiving a Notice of Allowance.

Submitted by:

Anthony Asquith
Regn 32373
Agent for the Applicant

US.Pat.Ap.Nr. 10/077,846 Docket 268-570S

AMENDMENTS TO SPECIFICATION
as submitted in response to O/A dated 16 July 2003

[0010/1 (currently amended)] By way of further explanation of the first aspect of the invention, exemplary embodiments of the invention will now be described with reference to the accompanying drawings, in which:
Fig 1 is a diagrammatic cross-sectioned side view of a system for treating wastewater that embodies the invention.
Fig 2 is a pictorial view of a body of foam material, which is a component of the system of Fig 1.
Fig 3 is a close-up of a portion of Fig 1.
Fig 4 is a plan view of the treatment system of Fig 1.
Fig 5a is a diagrammatic cross-sectioned view of a pipe containing a body of treatment material.
Fig 5b is the same view as Fig 5a, but shows a different condition.
Figs 6a,6b correspond to Figs 5a,5b, but show a different treatment material.
Fig 7 is an end view of another system for treating wastewater that embodies the invention.
Fig 8 is a cross-sectioned side-view of the system of Fig 7.
Fig 9 is an end view, like Fig 7 of another system that embodies the invention.
Fig 9a is a cross-sectioned side-view of the system of Fig 9.
Fig 10 is a pictorial view of another system that embodies the invention.
Fig 16 is a pictorial view of another system that embodies the invention.

[0064a (new)] On the other hand, sometimes, it may be desired to spread the treatment system out over a horizontally large area, and at the same time to provide the desired freedom from channeling. Fig 16 illustrates a treatment system in which the water-conduit is divided into several sub-troughs. The sub-troughs 180 are formed, in this case, in the valleys of a piece 182 of corrugated impervious material, disposed horizontally. The valleys contain respective bodies of treatment material 184. The ends of the valleys comprise entry and exit ports, which communicate with a common entry chamber 185 and a common exit chamber 186.

[0149/1 (currently amended)] It should be noted that the treatment apparatus as described herein, regarding the second aspect of the invention, is intended only for promoting the anaerobic digestion reactions. After having passed through the anaerobic treatment stage, in the treatment-pipe, the water has to be aerated, to promote the needed aerobic treatment reactions. The aerobic treatment station is not included in the second aspect of the invention, and the treatment-pipe, as described in the second aspect of the invention, [~~herein~~] cannot, by definition, be a part of the aerobic treatment station.

[0156/1 (currently amended)] If the desired average residence time for water passing through the system were one day, the minimum standing volume should be equal to one day's dosage. But the average residence time should not be set as low as one day, since that would leave too small a margin for variations. Rather, the designer should provide that the minimum-standing-body of water has a volume of preferably one-and-a-half times, and a minimum of one-and-a-quarter times, the average daily dose rate. Thus, where the dose rate is 3,000 litres per day, the volume of the minimum-standing-body preferably should be 4,500 litres. As mentioned, keeping the width and depth of the minimum-standing-body below one quarter of the standing-body-length, over at least half of the standing-body-length, [~~ensures~~] enables freedom from unwanted pathways. A [~~where the~~] treatment-pipe [~~is~~] less than one metre diameter[~~,~~] is suitable for installations dealing with up to about 15,000 litres per day, in that differences in residence time can be accommodated by using different lengths of treatment pipe.